

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claims 1-11 are currently under prosecution in the present application, with Claims 1 and 11 being independent claims, and Claim 12 being withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 and 11 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the objection to Claims 1-10, the above amendments are believed to overcome the objection.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 4-6 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the above amendments are believed to overcome the rejection.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication 52-18281 (hereinafter JP '281), the Examiner states that JP '281 anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Jp '281 discloses a tool unit 2 for a handheld power tool 1 having an oscillating output unit 3 (Fig. 1), comprising a fastening means 9 for attachment to the output unit 1 (Fig. 2); a working edge 30 having a first end and a second end opposite the first end (Fig. 5); and a first lateral boundary line 41 (Fig. 7), wherein the working edge 30 transitions at the first end into the first lateral boundary line 41 and forms with the first lateral boundary line 41 at the first end a cutting angle (Figs. 3-5, 7 and 10). Jp '281 discloses nowhere the cutting angle being equal to

or less than 95°. The cutting angle of Jp '281 appears as an obtuse angle much greater than 95° (Figs. 3-5, 7 and 10). Jp '281 fails to disclose at least the limitation of *the working edge forms with the first lateral boundary line at the first end a cutting angle of less than or equal to 95°* taught by Amended Claim 1.


Clearly, Claim 1 structurally differs from JP '281.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 11 with respect to Jp '281.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1-11, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233